

Procter & Gamble - I.P. Division**IMPORTANT CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE**

The documents accompanying this telecopy transmission contain confidential information belonging to the sender which is legally protected. The information is intended only for the use of the individual or entity named below. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or the taking of any action in reliance on the contents of this telecopied information is strictly prohibited. If you have received this telecopy in error, please immediately notify us by telephone (collect) to arrange for return of the telecopied document to us.

**FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL SHEET AND
CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION UNDER 37 CFR 1.8**

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
APR 19 2006**

TO: Commissioner for Patents - United States Patent and Trademark Office

Fax No. 571-273-8300

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office on April 19, 2006, to the above-identified facsimile number.

Cheryl L. Martin (Signature)

FROM: Cheryl L. Martin (Typed or printed name of person signing Certificate)

Fax No. 513-634-3499

Phone No. 513-634-1119

Listed below are the item(s) being submitted with this Certificate of Transmission:**

1) Reply to Office Action (2 pages)

Number of Pages Including this Page: 3

Inventor(s): Donald C. Roe

S.N.: 10/717,098

Filed: November 19, 2003

Case: 4981C2C

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

Reply dated 19 April 2006

1 of 2

APR 19 2006**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Application No.: 10/717,098

Inventor: Roe

Filed: 19 November 2003

Art Unit: 3761

Examiner: Jacqueline F. Stephens

Docket No.: 4981C2C

Confirmation No.: 7301

Customer No.: 27752

Title: Disposable Absorbent Article Having Capacity To Store Low-Viscosity Fecal Material**REPLY TO OFFICE ACTION**

Commissioner for Patents

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

In response to the Office Action mailed on 6 April 2006, reconsideration is hereby respectfully requested in view of the fact that the Patent cited in the rejections in this Office Action does not constitute prior art with respect to the present Application, as explained in the following remarks.

Remarks appear on page 2 of this paper.